

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 15 and 17 are amended. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in the specification at paragraph [0023] and in Figure 1. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Whipple in the June 24, 2008 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. As agreed to at the interview, the amendments to the claims distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6-9, 11-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032251 to Rhoads et al. (Rhoads). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The relevant portion of amended claim 1 recites, "a method for providing a copy of a document, comprising; storing or uploading at least one of a plurality of documents in at least one of a plurality of document repositories; associating each document identifier with at least one of the plurality of documents stored in at least one of the plurality of document repositories." Additionally, amended claim 15 recites a system and amended claim 17 recites a method with similar features. Rhoads does not teach such a method or system.

Rhoads merely discloses a document, like a business card, with an identifier, such as a web address, that links the recipient of the document to the internet or an online database. The recipient of the document is linked to the internet by optically scanning the document and reading the identifier from the specified location on the document. For example, a business

card can be optically scanned, and if the scanner reads data printed on a portion of the business card has been earmarked to hold the identifying data, the user is connected, to a website or portion of an online database that is indicated by the identifying data. The recipient of the document is thus directed to online data chosen and maintained by the party that issued the document to the recipient.

Conversely, the present claims are directed to a method or system where documents are stored or uploaded to document repositories. A user then receives and stores on a first medium a plurality of document identifiers, these document identifiers are associated with at least one of the documents stored in the document repositories. The first medium can then be linked to the document repositories, and the document identifiers received and stored by the user on the first medium are associated with the documents stored in the linked document repositories that correspond to the document identifiers. Finally, copies of the identified documents onto a second medium are produced. Rhoads does not teach a method or a system where a user receives its document identifiers that are stored on a first medium and associated with documents stored in at least one document repository, and the identified documents stored in the document repository are copied to a second medium when the user links the first medium to the document repository.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Rhoads does not anticipate claims 1, 15 and 17. Claims 2-14, 16 and 18-20 variously depend from claims 1, 15 and 17 and, thus, also are not anticipated by Rhoads. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Rhoads in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149765 to Aldstadt et al. (Aldstadt); rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Rhoads in view of Aldstadt and

further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0089766 to Needham et al. (Needham); and rejects claims 5, 10, 14 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Rhoads in view of Needham. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Rhoads does not teach nor does Rhoads suggest, each and every feature of amended claims 1 and 17. Further, Aldstadt and Needham do not address the discrepancies of Rhoads as to claims 1 and 17. Therefore, Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claims 1 and 17. Thus, claims 1 and 17 would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads, Aldstadt, and Needham. Claims 3-5, 10, 14 and 20 variously depend from claims 1 and 17 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Rhoads, Aldstadt and Needham. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Nicolas A. Brentlinger
Registration No. 62,211

JAO:NAB/hms

Date: June 27, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
